



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,719	07/12/2001	Scott J. Broussard	AUS920010259US1	9280
35617	7590	10/21/2004		EXAMINER
CONLEY ROSE, P.C. P.O. BOX 684908 AUSTIN, TX 78768			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PL

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/903,719	BROUSSARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James H Blackwell	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/10/01</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated (specification suggests that these are prior art). See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (hereinafter Chan, U.S. Patent No. 6,073,147).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 10, and 19), Chan teaches that individual users can create documents (*executing client programs*) at the various computers (12), and thereafter transmit those documents to other nodes

(one being a second computer) on the network, for viewing (using a display device, and presumably some display software or driver), for editing and/or printing at remote sites (Col. 3, lines 20-22). When a document (containing text strings) is transmitted (a first request), for example from the site of its creation (a first computer) to a remote site (a second computer), the computer at the remote site (second computer) first determines whether information pertaining to all of the fonts contained in the document (containing text strings) is stored at the remote site (containing a second computer and display device). If not, the necessary font resources are downloaded from the font server to the remote site, via any suitable communications network. Once the resources have been downloaded, the document can be viewed and printed at the remote site (Col. 2, lines 15-23). Chan also teaches a network available font server (20) that contains font resources that can be made available to users so that documents can be viewed and printed in their original form at any site, but which eliminates the need to transmit the font resource along with the content of the document (Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 1-2). Chan does not teach that the font server exists on a first computer. However, Chan suggests that all of the computers (12) are accessible to one another on a network, including the computer running the font server (20) making it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that the font server could have executed on any of the computers in the network, providing the benefit of access to font data not existing on the local computers. Chan continues to teach that a user at one of the computer nodes (12) on the network has received a document (22) that he desires to view and/or print at that node. Upon generation of a command to display the

document, it is first examined to identify each font contained in the document (Step 24). The particular manner in which this examination is carried out is determined by the host system, e.g. application program, which is accessing the document. For example, a word processing program may look for particular font codes in the document. For each identified font, a determination is made whether the resources necessary to generate that font, e.g. bitmap or outline glyph data, are stored at the computer (Step 26). If the necessary resources are available for all of the identified fonts, the characters are generated and displayed in the normal manner at Steps 28 and 30. If, however, the data for one or more identified fonts are not stored at the node, a request is transmitted to the font server (20) for the necessary resources (Step 32) (Col. 4, lines 10-29). When the font resources are retrieved from the font server, they are stored at the requesting node for use to display the document in the way that was intended (Col. 5, lines 52-59).

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claims 11, and 20), Chan teaches that if the necessary resources are available for all of the identified fonts, the characters are generated and displayed in the normal manner at Steps 28 and 30 (Col. 4, lines 23-26; compare with Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 11, and 20), “*... the graphic server program in the second computer is further adapted to display a graphic representation of the text string on the display device if the graphic representation is available on the second computer*”).

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claims 17, and 23), Chan teaches that the transformed character data is then returned to the requesting node (Step 48). When the data is received, the node stores the data (Step 50), which is

then used to generate the characters and display the document at that site (Col. 5, lines 55-59; compare with Claim 3 (and similarly Claims 17, and 23), “***... the second computer is further adapted to store the new graphical representation within a cache memory of the second computer when the new graphical representation is forwarded to the second computer***”). Chan does not specifically teach how the node stores the data (memory or disk drive, for example). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to store the font data somehow on the node needing the font data, whether it be in memory (cache or otherwise), or on a storable medium such as a hard drive (cache storage can be on a disk drive). The benefit of either method being to enable a document to be completely rendered on a display, or printed on a print device without missing characters.

In regard to dependent Claim 5 (and similarly dependent Claim 21), Chan teaches that the description of the characters can be in any one or more well-known formats including bit-mapped and outline (Col. 3, lines 36-38). The formats in this invention pertain to the fonts used in the document that was created by one node (12) and displayed on another node (12) whether the font information came from the nodes (12) (i.e., was stored there already), or was obtained and transmitted from the font server (20) to the displaying node (12).

In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claim 25), Chan fails to specifically teach that *the network comprises an X Window graphical interface*. However, Chan does teach that if fonts information is not found on the node (12), then the necessary font resources are downloaded from the font server to the remote site,

via any suitable communications network (Col. 2, lines 18-20). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention in view of Chan to use X Windows, or any other interface available, providing the benefit of a protocol for transmission of missing font information.

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Chan fails to specifically teach that *the client program is a Java application program*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a client written in Java, just as it would have been obvious to write the client in any other compatible programming language such as C++, Python, etc. The benefit would have been to provide a variety of programming languages so that a programmer could choose the most appropriate language for the situation.

In regard to dependent Claim 8 (and similarly dependent Claims 14, and 22), Chan fails to teach that *the new graphic representation is created by a font rasterizer within a Java virtual machine (JVM) running in the first computer*. Chan does discuss a process that reads on the process of rasterization for both bit-map and outline fonts where the display application makes the determination, and sends the appropriate information to the font server so that the font(s) that are needed, and the characters that are needed are properly generated and sent back to the application that then uses this information to accurately display the font (Col. 5, lines 1-34). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a font rasterizer, regardless of its source, to apply the proper parameters to the font data in

order to provide the benefit of generating the appropriate font for the application to used in accurately displaying the document.

In regard to dependent Claim 9 (and similarly dependent Claim 18), Chan fails to specifically teach that *the second request for the text string forwarded from the second computer to the first computer comprises an X logical font descriptor*. However, Chan does teach that the request that is transmitted from the computer at the node (12) to the font server (20) comprises a pair of key terms, consisting of a font identification and a character identification, as shown in Fig. 4A. The font identification is determined as a result of the examination of the document, and identifies a particular font to be employed. The identification of the font can be in the form of an integer value, or can be a character string such as the name of the font, e.g. "Kanji Roman". The second element of the key pair, namely the character identification, specifies a particular character within the font of interest. The identification of the character can be in the form of a 7-bit ASCII code. Preferably, however, the character identification is implemented in a more universally employed Unicode, which can comprise 16 bits or more (Col. 4, lines 31-44). Though Chan does not teach that the font descriptor is an X logical font descriptor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use any means of portraying the font descriptor, as long as the font server understands how to extract or otherwise use the information contained in the descriptor. In a standard X environment, it would have made sense to use a compatible font descriptor. With other environments, other formats would make more sense (such as Unicode).

In regard to dependent Claims 12-13, and 15-16, Claims 12-13, and 15-16 reflect the computer system and method as defined in Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 10, and 19) and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Sheldon (from Tom Sheldon's Linktionary.com, downloaded from <http://www.linktionary.com/x/xwindow.html>, Copyright 2001).

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claim 24), Chan fails to teach that *the first and second computers use an operating system selected from a group consisting of Unix, AIX, OS/390 and Linux*. However, Sheldon teaches that the X Window System, or "X" as it is sometimes called, can be thought of as a terminal for UNIX environments with a graphical user interface (p. 1 of 2, 1st paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Chan and Sheldon because Chan teaches a system that could have been Unix-based, and by the definition provided by Sheldon, Unix-based systems typically use X Windows. The benefit would have been to provide an operating system under which to operate the claimed computer system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
10/13/04



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER